

Summary

NPS Winter Use Roving Team Meeting with EPA

Date: 11/03/05

Location: 999 18th Street, Denver, CO

Present: Joe Delwiche, Phil Strobel, John Sacklin, Denice Swanke, Mike Yochim, Nicholas Dewar

1. Purpose agency/group or NPS gave for wanting a visit at this time:

To have a relatively un-orchestrated opportunity for dialogue about the Winter Use Plan

2. Results of this meeting and/or next steps:

2.1. Next steps in EIS process

2.1.1. NPS will publish the Scenarios in late November/early December.

2.2. Other

2.2.1. EPA will tell NPS whom they should contact at OTAQ. At least for the initial contact, Phil Strobel requests that NPS contact OTAQ via him.

2.2.2. EPA can assemble a group to provide input to follow-up on Gary Bishop's report.

2.2.3. EPA can help consider what BATs for snow coaches would look like.

2.2.4. EPA offers to review the modeling plan as soon as it is prepared. NPS expects ARS to deliver this in mid-November.

2.2.5. EPA requests a copy of the existing sound-scape report (if they don't have it already). Denice Swanke offers to provide it if necessary.

2.2.6. NPS reported that Wyoming has requested a meeting of Cooperating Agencies (CAs) to review the formulation of Alternatives prior to the CAs DEIS review. NPS will consider this and see if it is possible to accommodate it in the schedule, and if so how to do it. EPA said they would want to be part of this meeting if it occurs.

2.2.7. NPS reported that it is considering distributing modeling information to CAs and other major stakeholders if there is time to do this.

2.2.8. NPS invites comments from EPA regarding the Scenarios.

2.2.9. EPA requests that Modelers be instructed by NPS to consider the bullet-list in the EPA's letter to Coleman.

2.2.10. EPA (Phil Strobel) will contact Montana and Wyoming directly to request that they provide EPA with copies of scoping comment letters that they submit to NPS.

3. Points raised:

- 3.1. EPA asked “did the courts which heard the complaints about the EIS remand the EIS itself, or just the Decisions?” Only the Decisions were remanded, so the current EIS will incorporate parts of the prior EISs.
- 3.2. Any air quality modeling of Scenario J will need to model the phase-in of 2006 EPA snowmobile requirements. The models will also need to determine (or make assumptions for) the mix of types of snowmobile that enter the Park for the purposes of developing a “fleet average” for the model. It was noted that BAT is not specified for snow coaches in scenarios A and J.
- 3.3. The ten Scenarios will not all be transformed into Alternatives. It is anticipated that five or six Alternatives will be crafted on the basis of these Scenarios. The Scenarios will be subjected to air quality and sound-scape modeling, as well as some wildlife analysis and an analysis of operational practicality. Economic modeling will be performed on the Alternatives (but not on the Scenarios).
- 3.4. NPS intends to include major stakeholders in any meetings arranged for CAs. NPS is also considering posting the technical review draft of the DEIS on its website to enhance public participation.
- 3.5. The EPA found it very helpful in the prior EIS process to have regular meetings (or at least teleconferences) with the other CAs. EPA feels disadvantaged not to have such meetings in the current EIS process. They would like to know what are the important interests held by other active CAs. NPS said that they are willing to provide the notes of the meetings held between the NPS “Roving Team” and other CAs. They might even post these on the NPS website.
- 3.6. NPS reported that Wyoming has requested copies of scoping comment letters and NPS has agreed to send copies of the substantive letters that they have selected. They are also considering posting some of the scoping comment letters at their website.
- 3.7. EPA considered meeting with Wyoming, Montana and/or Idaho without necessarily expecting NPS to arrange a meeting. NPS encouraged EPA to conduct such meetings and suggested that they include ARS in the meetings.

4. Questions asked:

- 4.1. Does the peak day average of 1,460 include Grand Teton? (page 4 of hand-out)
- 4.2. Why has neither of the law-suits been appealed?
- 4.3. How much does it cost to maintain Sylvan Pass each winter?
- 4.4. How did guiding become a criterion?
- 4.5. Are the limits for snowmobiles and coaches “allowed averages” or maximum limits (Scenario F)?
- 4.6. What assumptions were made for snow-coaches per day in the prior EIS?
- 4.7. Who owns the “Yellow Buses”, and how is their use allocated?
- 4.8. With whom should NPS communicate at OTAQ?
- 4.9. Will sound-scape modeling look at all three standard aspects: frequency, magnitude and duration?